

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-27 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 14 and 21 have been amended by the present amendment.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy of an interview extended to Applicant's representatives on February 2, 2004. During the interview, differences between the present invention and the applied art, and the rejections noted in the outstanding Office Action were discussed. No agreement was reached pending the Examiner's further review when a response is filed. Arguments presented during the interview are reiterated below.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-12, 14 and 16-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as unpatentable over King et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,737) in view of Freivald et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,898,836).

Claims 1-12, 14 and 16-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as anticipated by King et al. in view of Freivald et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a method for production, revision and hierarchical organization of electronic documents on a computer system that includes inputting a first item description and a first item category, generating a first item identifier, generating a first item description electronic document, storing the first item description electronic document, generating a first category list electronic document, generating a log file, updating the log file, and deciding whether to transfer at least one of the first item description electronic document and the first category list electronic document to a second computer. The first item identifier corresponds to the first item description. The first item description electronic document includes the first item description, the first item category and the first item identifier. The first item description electronic document is stored in a first digital storage

area in a first computer. The first category list electronic document is generated, in the first computer, corresponding to the first item category to include at least a portion of the first item description and a reference to the first item description electronic document, prior to receiving a request for the first category list electronic document from a web browser. The log file contains at least one entry defining a modification to at least one of the first item description electronic document and the first category list electronic document. The log file is updated to include the at least one entry at a time when the at least one modification defined by the entry is made to at least one of the first item description electronic document and the first category list electronic document. Deciding whether to transfer at least one of the first item description electronic document and the first category list electronic document to a second computer is based on whether the log file contains the at least one entry defining the modification for a corresponding electronic document.

Amended independent Claims 14 and 21 include similar features regarding the log file.

In a non-limiting example, Figures 7 and 3-6 illustrate that the log file is updated to include at least one entry defining a modification at a time when a item description is added, modified, and/or deleted (see also specification at page 16, lines 12-15). As shown in Figures 3-6, the log file is updated when a user 302 action causes a modification to the first item description electronic document and/or the first category list electronic document.

Freivald et al. do not teach or suggest updating a log file to include at least one entry at a time when at least one modification is made to at least one of the first item description electronic document and the first category list electronic document. Instead, Freivald et al. disclose that a periodic comparison every few days is made of a registered web page document to determine if the document has changed using a checksum or CRC of the document (column 7, lines 18-24; column 6, lines 46-54; and Figure 3). Thus, Freivald et al.

do not disclose an operation made at a time when a modification is made to an electronic document, but rather a periodic operation which detects when changes occur to a registered document on the Internet possibly several days later (column 3, lines 49-51; and Figure 3).

Freivald et al. do not disclose an operation made at a time when a modification is made to an electronic document because the operation is necessarily removed from the actual modification to the document on the remote computer and, instead, merely discovers a modification to the document on the remote computer by means of a search some period of time later.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that the checksum or CRC of the document, disclosed in Freivald et al., is not equivalent to a log file containing at least one entry defining a modification for a corresponding electronic document. Rather, as generally accepted by those skilled in the art, a checksum is a binary value computed by summing the bytes or words of a data block. Freivald et al. disclose that a change is detected by comparing a periodically generated fresh checksum with the original checksum (column 4, lines 17-19). Thus, the checksum or CRC of the document, disclosed in Freivald et al., does not contain modifications for a corresponding electronic document.

Further, Freivald et al. do not teach or suggest transferring at least one of the first item description electronic document and the first category list electronic document to a second computer based on whether the log file contains the at least one entry defining the modification for a corresponding electronic document. Instead, Freivald et al. disclose that when a change is detected, the user is signaled by e-mail (column 6, lines 24-31; and column 4, lines 37-40). Thus, Freivald et al. disclose a system for merely notifying a user when updates are made to desired information previously found with a search such as a bug fix or other revision in a software program (column 1, lines 46-49; and column 4, lines 19-21).

King et al. do not overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Freivald et al. Further, King et al. disclose a method where the entire document, which contains a complete set of Web pages, is reformatted for each change to layout, structure or content, thereby dictating larger bandwidth transmission demands (column 7, lines 1-14). Thus, unlike the present application, the King patent is not practical for typical Web management situations where there may be a large number of Web pages with frequent changes that are relatively small, involving one or a few Web pages, in comparison to the entire size of all the Web pages.

As stated in MPEP § 2143, a basic requirement for a *prima facie* case of obviousness is that the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claimed limitations. As the cited references do not teach or suggest updating a log file to include at least one entry defining a modification at a time when at least one modification is made to at least one of the first item description electronic document and the first category list electronic document nor transferring at least one of the first item description electronic document and the first category list electronic document to a second computer based on whether the log file contains at least one entry defining the modification for a corresponding electronic document, it is respectfully submitted the outstanding Office Action has not created a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to independent Claim 1, 14 and 21 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 14 and 21 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Additionally, applicant submits that the amendments to Claims 1, 14 and 21 are merely provided to clarify the claimed invention and are not believed to be more narrow to those claims in scope in any aspect compared to previously presented Claims 1, 14 and 21.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present supplemental amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/03)



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870